Lead Entity Advisory Group

May 22, 2006

Tacoma Public Library Tacoma, WA 98402 Final Summary Notes

LEAG Attendance:

Doug Osterman, WRIA 9 (King)

Jeanette Dorner, Nisqually Tribe

John Sims, Quinault Nation Joy Juelson, Chelan County Bret Nine, Pend Oreille CD

Paul Dorn, Kitsap LE

Richard Brocksmith, Hood Canal Coordinating Council Alex Conley, Yakima Basin Fish & Wildlife Recovery Board

Richard Visser, WDFW

Alan Chapman, Lummi Tribe WRIA 1 Mary Jorgenson, WRIA 8 (King)

Amy Hatch-Winecka, WRIA 13 (Thurston) & WRIA 14 (Mason)

Lorin Reinelt, Pierce County LE

Barbara Rosenkotter, San Juan County LE

Cheryl Baumann, NOPLE Rob Plotnikoff, DOE Bob Cusimano, DOE

Lauri Vigue, WDFW

Melissa Paulson, WDFW

Tim Smith, WDFW Steve Penland, WDFW Doug Hennick, WDFW Doris Small, WDFW

Leslie Ryan-Connoly, IAC/SRFB

WDFW Report

WDFW, in a solicitation letter from Director Koenings dated May 5, has begun recruitment for nominees to fill three LEAG positions. These vacancies are a result of term expirations for current LEAG members Paul Dorn, Jeff Breckel, and Steve Martin. Persons interested in serving a three-year term on LEAG should direct nomination letters, as well as a short personal statement of interest, to Lauri Vigue by June 1, 2006. At the August meeting the LEAG will elect new officers.

Final bills for the current fiscal year must be submitted to WDFW no later than July 14 for payment. Any questions or concerns regarding this requirement must be directed to WDFW as soon as possible. Additionally, criteria for requesting additional funding for next fiscal year are being developed and will be distributed when they become available. Lauri will also provide a draft of contract deliverables for next fiscal year for review by lead entities.

Lauri presented a progress report on the Habitat Work Schedule prepared by project lead, Erik Neatherlin. The RFP will be completed by the end of June 2006 and a vendor hired by September 2006. The draft Project Charter was also distributed for comments.

The Lead Entity/Watershed Steward Training Workshop has been scheduled for July 18 and 19, and will be held at the Ocean Shores Shilo Inn. More information on the

08/17/2006

workshop will be forthcoming shortly.

Governor's Forum on Monitoring

Richard Brocksmith reported that the Governor's Forum on Monitoring and Governor's Salmon Recovery Office are currently working on an updated version of the State of the Salmon Report. In addition, NOAA's April 2006 final guidance document on Research, Monitoring and Evaluation for Salmon Recovery Planning provides that delisting of species will be done according to the best available science on habitat (in addition to fish data), though it would be preferable to collect data (specifically, on the listing factors). So, the question that the GFM is asking is whether the status and trends monitoring framework being produced by the Department of Ecology can answer questions at the right scale and for the right listing factor. This question is unique to regions, and must be answered regionally. NOAA will work with regions to finalize plans by December 2006. Additional information can be found at http://www.iac.wa.gov/Documents/Monitoring/agendas&minutes/04-2006/1130 Status of NOAA Guidance on Monitoring.pdf

Rob Plotnikoff and Bob Cusimano, Washington Department of Ecology, provided information on the new SRFB-funded cumulative effectiveness monitoring program, called Status and Trends Monitoring for Watershed Health and Salmon Recovery. The program will focus on water quality and freshwater habitat. Such cumulative effectiveness monitoring is related to direct effectiveness monitoring (done for specific actions such as habitat projects) in that a baseline for habitat must first be obtained (status) before any determination can be made as to the changes over time (trends). This statewide effort will be valuable to salmon recovery by documenting long-term habitat trends useful in delisting decisions and in making extrapolations from Intensively Monitored Watersheds (validation monitoring) to all state watersheds. Additional information can be found at http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/eap/stsmf/

Lead Entity Restructuring Update

Northeast Washington (Bret Nine) – Pend Oreille is currently one watershed, but is working with USFWS, GSRO, WDFW, and IAC to move towards expanding to include six watersheds. The new regional area will center on recovery of listed bull trout.

NOPLE (Cheryl Baumann) – NOPLE currently includes four WRIAs, one of which (WRIA 20) has been identified by SRFB as perhaps more appropriately included in Coastal LE processes, rather than with Puget Sound LEs. For the current grant year, NOPLE will continue to operate as one lead entity, but will enlist extra staffing help to participate in two regional funding processes; WRIA 20 projects will be included in Coastal operations, whereas WRIAs 17, 18, and 19 will continue to participate in Shared Strategy processes.

Klickitat (Richard Visser) – The move to include the Klickitat LE in the Yakima Regional planning process will be challenging, as Klickitat has been quite successful in the past and has little incentive to work towards being rolled-up into the Yakima region. However, discussions continue and efforts are ongoing, with the hope that a more inclusive approach will be adopted in the future.

Coast (John Sims) – The three lead entities currently in the Coastal region (Pacific County LE, Grays Harbor County LE, and Quinault LE) have reached consensus that there is little need for creation of a formal regional organization; the lead entities are committed to a collaborative work approach. These lead entities feel they would benefit from assistance reaching agreement on a sub-allocation formula for the upcoming SRFB funding cycle.

Upper Columbia (Joy Juelson, Lauri Vique) - There is discussion that Chelan County

2 08/17/2006

	LE and Okanogan/ Colville LEs may move towards adopting a regional approach. The Upper Columbia Board is currently working to hire an executive director.
SRFB 2006 Funding Cycle & Shared Strategy 3-year Lists	Leslie Ryan-Connoly (IAC) presented a draft of the 2006 SRFB timeline for funding. In addition, she relayed that the two "preferred" methods of presentation to the SRFB would be: 1) SRFB receives one regionalized list from each of eight recovery regions; 2) SRFB receives separate lists from each lead entity, but applies a regionally agreed-upon allocation formula to individual lists to determine funding appropriations. Discussion of this draft timeline by lead entity representatives included the following concerns:
	 The members of the Review Panel should be determined as soon as possible. It may be difficult for lead entities to schedule Review Panel visits of local projects before the regionally prioritized list has been developed. This is particularly problematic for Puget Sound lead entities because the regional list will not be available until late July. The schedule does not clearly indicate the evaluation of regional project lists for consistency with regional recovery strategies and plans, whichever is applicable. A draft proposal for clarifying how this could be approached is attached. The proposed schedule may not adequately address issues of lead entity involvement in the regional prioritization approach. Funding decisions by SRFB members should take into account the level of involvement of lead entities, addressing questions such as: How were lead entities involved? What level of consensus was reached? Is consensus among the regional council an acceptable substitution for consensus among the regional council an acceptable substitution for consensus among lead entity citizen committees? There is concern that the September 11, 2006, deadline for completion of project applications does not provide adequate time for the regional prioritization process. Some lead entities indicated that the current deadline would present challenges for completion of local lead entity lists, as well. The process for SRFB 2006 funding cycle may not square with Washington State statutory requirements. There is concern that the SRFB process reflect both the letter and spirit of legislative language, which is an issue for the Department of Fish and Wildlife to wrangle with. There is a strong need for clear understanding on the interactions between regional organizations and lead entities. Questions and concerns on this topic include: Will regions be permitted to reorder local lead entity project lists? Will regions be held to the same level of accountability as the lead entiti
Next Meeting Dates	August 15; Location Tacoma Public Library

3 08/17/2006